

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11 and 12 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 11 and 12 do not introduce any new subject matter.

ALLOWED CLAIMS AND ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 6-11 are allowed.

Applicants also gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants reserve the right to rewrite claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 in independent form in a subsequent response or communication.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner's objection to claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the cited reference.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 4, 5, 15 and 16.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner states that the limitation "I is a natural number obtained by subtracting 1 from the number of blocks constituting a picture of the TFT-LCD" is not

clear because if "I" is a constant, this "would not define all the boundary pixels between adjacent blocks except the ones between the block before the last block and the last block."

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants are permitted to define the scope of claims, as long as Applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope other than that defined in the claims.

M.P.E.P. Section 2173.04, states that:

Breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. In re Miller, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). If the scope of the subject matter embraced by the claims is clear, and if applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims, then the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

M.P.E.P. § 2173.04 (Rev. 10/05).

Further, M.P.E.P. Section 2172, states that:

Evidence that shows that a claim does not correspond in scope with that which applicant regards as applicant's invention may be found, for example, in contentions or admissions contained in briefs or remarks filed by applicant, Solomon v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 216 F.3d 1372, 55 USPQ2d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2000); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969), or in affidavits filed under 37 CFR 1.132, In re Cormany, 476 F.2d 998, 177 USPQ 450 (CCPA 1973). The content of applicant's specification is not used as evidence that the scope of the claims is inconsistent with the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

M.P.E.P. § 2172 (Rev. 10/05).

Applicants respectfully submit that the scope of the subject matter of claim 2 is clear. Specifically, claim 2 recites that "I is a natural number obtained by subtracting 1 from the number of blocks constituting a picture of the TFT-LCD". With respect to claim 2, "I" is a constant based on the number of blocks, which defines the boundary pixels between adjacent blocks.

If claim 2 is limited to the boundary pixels between the block before the last block and the last block, as the Examiner suggests, such a limitation is proper and in compliance with section 112, because Applicants have not otherwise indicated that they intend the invention to be of a scope different from that defined in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,313,889 ("Song").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 12, as amended, are not anticipated by Song.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a non-boundary pixel separated from the boundary of adjacent blocks by at least the boundary pixel and a non-boundary data line corresponding to the non-boundary pixel. The non-boundary data line is not the same data line as the boundary data line and does not include an extension part overlapping a portion of the pixel electrode corresponding to the non-boundary pixel.

The Examiner maintains that "every pixel [of Song] is a boundary pixel", and that "Song's individual data line with corresponding pixels can be considered as a block" with "any data line D" comprising a boundary data line. See February 23, 2006 Office Action at 3.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a non-boundary pixel separated from the boundary of adjacent blocks by at least the boundary pixel. Accordingly, unlike Song, every pixel as

claimed is not a boundary pixel.

Moreover, unlike Song, the claimed embodiment includes boundary data lines and non-boundary data lines that are different from (i.e., not the same line as) the boundary data lines.

Furthermore, unlike Song, the non-boundary line lacks an extension part in the non-boundary pixel. In contrast, the connect portion 21 of Song is formed in each pixel region to provide a repair function in the pixel unit of the matrix-type display device when the data line formed with the connect portion is disconnected. See Song, col. 17, lines 4-67; Figs. 19A-19C.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended is not anticipated by and is patentable over Song. For at least the reason that claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, claims 2-3 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to recite a non-boundary data line different from the boundary data line (i.e., not the same data line as the boundary line), and corresponding to the non-boundary pixel region. Further, claim 12, as previously presented, recites each block having a boundary pixel region arranged adjoining the neighboring block and a non-boundary pixel region spaced apart from the neighboring block.

As stated above, the Examiner maintains that "every pixel [of Song] is a boundary pixel". Also, the Examiner states that Song's data line is both a boundary data line and a non-boundary data line. See February 23, 2006 Office Action at 3-4.

In contrast, claim 12 recites each block having a boundary pixel region arranged adjoining the neighboring block and a non-boundary pixel region spaced apart from the neighboring block. Accordingly, unlike Song, every pixel as claimed is not a boundary pixel.

Indeed, the Examiner maintains that "each data line and corresponding pixels of Song is considered a block". Therefore, under the Examiner's reasoning, there is only one column of pixels in a block (i.e., every pixel is a boundary pixel). However, each block as recited in claim 12 (and in claim 1) has at least two pixel regions (i.e., a boundary pixel region and a non-boundary pixel region).

Moreover, unlike Song, the claimed embodiment includes boundary data lines and non-boundary data lines that are different from (i.e., not the same line as) the boundary data lines.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, as amended is not anticipated by and is patentable over Song. For at least the reason that claims 13-14 depend from claim 12, claims 13-14 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that claims 1-3 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888